

U.S. Department of Education
2014 National Blue Ribbon Schools Program

[X] Public or [] Non-public

For Public Schools only: (Check all that apply) [X] Title I [] Charter [] Magnet [] Choice

Name of Principal Mr. Todd R. Sauer

(Specify: Ms., Miss, Mrs., Dr., Mr., etc.) (As it should appear in the official records)

Official School Name Lowell Elementary School

(As it should appear in the official records)

School Mailing Address 704 Third Avenue Northeast

(If address is P.O. Box, also include street address.)

City Brainerd State MN Zip Code+4 (9 digits total) 56401-2413

County Crow Wing County State School Code Number* _____

Telephone 218-454-6650 Fax 218-454-6551

Web site/URL http://lowell.isd181.org/ E-mail todd.sauer@isd181.org

Twitter Handle _____ Facebook Page _____ Google+ _____

YouTube/URL _____ Blog _____ Other Social Media Link _____

I have reviewed the information in this application, including the eligibility requirements on page 2 (Part I-Eligibility Certification), and certify that it is accurate.

Date _____
(Principal's Signature)

Name of Superintendent* Dr. Steve Razidlo E-mail: steve.razidlo@isd181.org
(Specify: Ms., Miss, Mrs., Dr., Mr., Other)

District Name ISD 181 Tel. 218-454-6900

I have reviewed the information in this application, including the eligibility requirements on page 2 (Part I-Eligibility Certification), and certify that it is accurate.

Date _____
(Superintendent's Signature)

Name of School Board
President/Chairperson Ruth Nelson
(Specify: Ms., Miss, Mrs., Dr., Mr., Other)

I have reviewed the information in this application, including the eligibility requirements on page 2 (Part I-Eligibility Certification), and certify that it is accurate.

Date _____
(School Board President's/Chairperson's Signature)

**Non-public Schools: If the information requested is not applicable, write N/A in the space.*

PART I – ELIGIBILITY CERTIFICATION

Include this page in the school’s application as page 2.

The signatures on the first page of this application (cover page) certify that each of the statements below concerning the school’s eligibility and compliance with U.S. Department of Education, Office for Civil Rights (OCR) requirements is true and correct.

1. The school configuration includes one or more of grades K-12. (Schools on the same campus with one principal, even a K-12 school, must apply as an entire school.)
2. The school has made its Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs) or Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) each year for the past two years and has not been identified by the state as “persistently dangerous” within the last two years.
3. To meet final eligibility, a public school must meet the state’s AMOs or AYP requirements in the 2013-2014 school year and be certified by the state representative. Any status appeals must be resolved at least two weeks before the awards ceremony for the school to receive the award.
4. If the school includes grades 7 or higher, the school must have foreign language as a part of its curriculum.
5. The school has been in existence for five full years, that is, from at least September 2008 and each tested grade must have been part of the school for the past three years.
6. The nominated school has not received the National Blue Ribbon Schools award in the past five years: 2009, 2010, 2011, 2012, or 2013.
7. The nominated school has no history of testing irregularities, nor have charges of irregularities been brought against the school at the time of nomination. The U.S. Department of Education reserves the right to disqualify a school’s application and/or rescind a school’s award if irregularities are later discovered and proven by the state.
8. The nominated school or district is not refusing Office of Civil Rights (OCR) access to information necessary to investigate a civil rights complaint or to conduct a district-wide compliance review.
9. The OCR has not issued a violation letter of findings to the school district concluding that the nominated school or the district as a whole has violated one or more of the civil rights statutes. A violation letter of findings will not be considered outstanding if OCR has accepted a corrective action plan from the district to remedy the violation.
10. The U.S. Department of Justice does not have a pending suit alleging that the nominated school or the school district as a whole has violated one or more of the civil rights statutes or the Constitution’s equal protection clause.
11. There are no findings of violations of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act in a U.S. Department of Education monitoring report that apply to the school or school district in question; or if there are such findings, the state or district has corrected, or agreed to correct, the findings.

PART II - DEMOGRAPHIC DATA

All data are the most recent year available.

DISTRICT (Question 1 is not applicable to non-public schools)

1. Number of schools in the district (per district designation):
- 6 Elementary schools (includes K-8)
 - 1 Middle/Junior high schools
 - 1 High schools
 - 0 K-12 schools
- 8 TOTAL

SCHOOL (To be completed by all schools)

2. Category that best describes the area where the school is located:
- ☐ Urban or large central city
 - ☐ Suburban with characteristics typical of an urban area
 - ☐ Suburban
 - ☒ Small city or town in a rural area
 - ☐ Rural
3. 15 Number of years the principal has been in her/his position at this school.
4. Number of students as of October 1 enrolled at each grade level or its equivalent in applying school:

Grade	# of Males	# of Females	Grade Total
PreK	0	0	0
K	34	39	73
1	45	45	90
2	45	37	82
3	44	47	91
4	46	48	94
5	0	0	0
6	0	0	0
7	0	0	0
8	0	0	0
9	0	0	0
10	0	0	0
11	0	0	0
12	0	0	0
Total Students	214	216	430

5. Racial/ethnic composition of the school:
- 2 % American Indian or Alaska Native
 - 1 % Asian
 - 3 % Black or African American
 - 1 % Hispanic or Latino
 - 0 % Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander
 - 93 % White
 - 0 % Two or more races
 - 100 % Total**

(Only these seven standard categories should be used to report the racial/ethnic composition of your school. The Final Guidance on Maintaining, Collecting, and Reporting Racial and Ethnic Data to the U.S. Department of Education published in the October 19, 2007 *Federal Register* provides definitions for each of the seven categories.)

6. Student turnover, or mobility rate, during the 2012 - 2013 year: 8%

This rate should be calculated using the grid below. The answer to (6) is the mobility rate.

Steps For Determining Mobility Rate	Answer
(1) Number of students who transferred <i>to</i> the school after October 1, 2012 until the end of the school year	12
(2) Number of students who transferred <i>from</i> the school after October 1, 2012 until the end of the 2012-2013 school year	22
(3) Total of all transferred students [sum of rows (1) and (2)]	34
(4) Total number of students in the school as of October 1	430
(5) Total transferred students in row (3) divided by total students in row (4)	0.079
(6) Amount in row (5) multiplied by 100	8

7. English Language Learners (ELL) in the school: 0 %
0 Total number ELL
 Number of non-English languages represented: 0
 Specify non-English languages:
8. Students eligible for free/reduced-priced meals: 48 %
 Total number students who qualify: 208

If this method is not an accurate estimate of the percentage of students from low-income families, or the school does not participate in the free and reduced-priced school meals program, supply an accurate estimate and explain how the school calculated this estimate.

9. Students receiving special education services: 13 %
60 Total number of students served

Indicate below the number of students with disabilities according to conditions designated in the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act. Do not add additional categories.

<u>9</u> Autism	<u>0</u> Orthopedic Impairment
<u>1</u> Deafness	<u>4</u> Other Health Impaired
<u>0</u> Deaf-Blindness	<u>9</u> Specific Learning Disability
<u>7</u> Emotional Disturbance	<u>18</u> Speech or Language Impairment
<u>0</u> Hearing Impairment	<u>0</u> Traumatic Brain Injury
<u>1</u> Mental Retardation	<u>1</u> Visual Impairment Including Blindness
<u>0</u> Multiple Disabilities	<u>10</u> Developmentally Delayed

10. Use Full-Time Equivalents (FTEs), rounded to nearest whole numeral, to indicate the number of personnel in each of the categories below:

	Number of Staff
Administrators	1
Classroom teachers	19
Resource teachers/specialists e.g., reading, math, science, special education, enrichment, technology, art, music, physical education, etc.	9
Paraprofessionals	18
Student support personnel e.g., guidance counselors, behavior interventionists, mental/physical health service providers, psychologists, family engagement liaisons, career/college attainment coaches, etc.	0

11. Average student-classroom teacher ratio, that is, the number of students in the school divided by the FTE of classroom teachers, e.g., 22:1 23:1

12. Show daily student attendance rates. Only high schools need to supply yearly graduation rates.

Required Information	2012-2013	2011-2012	2010-2011	2009-2010	2008-2009
Daily student attendance	96%	97%	96%	97%	97%
High school graduation rate	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%

13. **For schools ending in grade 12 (high schools)**

Show percentages to indicate the post-secondary status of students who graduated in Spring 2013

Post-Secondary Status	
Graduating class size	0
Enrolled in a 4-year college or university	0%
Enrolled in a community college	0%
Enrolled in career/technical training program	0%
Found employment	0%
Joined the military or other public service	0%
Other	0%

14. Indicate whether your school has previously received a National Blue Ribbon Schools award.

Yes X No

If yes, select the year in which your school received the award. 2005

PART III – SUMMARY

Located in Brainerd, Minnesota, Lowell is one of six elementary schools serving the students of Independent School District 181 in Central Minnesota. The district is vast in area and includes the cities of Brainerd, Baxter and Nisswa, as well as several smaller communities. The area is known for its hundreds of lakes, which makes it a popular vacation destination. Brainerd sits along the Mississippi River and has a rich railroad heritage. Lowell School is named after James Russell Lowell; poet, literary critic and diplomat. It was built in 1939 as part of the Federal Works Agency to be a “neighborhood” school. To this day, students, families and staff are a tight knit group we call our “Lowell Family.”

Lowell Elementary provides education for approximately 430 students in kindergarten through fourth grade. The fabric of our student population consists of a diverse socio-economic background. It is our mission to promote a positive environment where acceptance, cooperation and high expectations are supported by students, parents and staff -- enabling success and life-long learning. Our vision is to provide a quality educational program for all students in a safe and caring environment. Our purpose is to help students reach their full potential by encouraging partnerships with families. We reach high standards by establishing a challenging and supportive learning climate, guided by data and strong curricula. This will prepare our students to live with integrity and resilience in a rapidly changing global community.

Lowell prides itself on its academic achievements. In 2005, we were awarded our first National Blue Ribbon Award. In 2013 we earned the title of “Reward School” for the second time, the highest building level achievement in Minnesota. We are only one of seventy-nine schools in the state that have received the “Reward School” designation twice. Among our surrounding schools and districts, Lowell Elementary attained the highest Multiple Measurement Rating of 96.69%. We attribute much of our success to the many programs we offer to meet the needs of each individual student.

The Title I program is available for students who qualify in the areas of reading and math. It offers supportive instruction to students needing an extra boost in these areas. In particular, our Reading Recovery program targets our most at-risk first grade readers and provides intensive one-on-one reading instruction.

Many students also participate in an after school CARE Team. The CARE Team strives to help children and their families build positive, nonviolent relationships through carefully planned and supervised interaction. Academic assistance is also provided through this program.

To minimize academic regression over the summer, we offer several programs. We provide a summer reading incentive for all students to encourage continued academic growth and success. Students track their minutes read throughout the summer and are recognized for their effort at a back-to-school assembly in September. In addition, approximately twenty-five percent of our students are invited to participate in more intensive summer programming. Summer school is held in June and August to support the areas of reading and math. The Tiger Book Club mails books to one hundred of our most at-risk readers. They receive a package of books each week during the summer. Packages include books to read, teaching tips for parents and blank books for students to write in.

As a means of supporting staff in continuing their professional growth, Lowell has developed various coaching models and learning communities. Literacy and peer coaches initiate new teacher acclimation to the profession. They also provide constructive feedback and present Best Practice methods for continued growth to seasoned educators. Our Professional Learning Communities (PLC’s) bring all of these components and our educators together to problem solve and discuss ideas to better meet the needs of students.

The Family Collaborative program was created in 1999 to help parents, children and schools work more efficiently together. Through the Family Collaborative program, we have a Counselor/Social Worker in our school to help with truancy, health issues and family support.

The AGATE (Area Gifted and Talented Education) program offered at Lowell follows a school-within-a-school model. It is designed for children who qualify through testing and are capable of high achievement. These students are provided with enrichment experiences beyond the basic curriculum. The program follows a three-fold plan encompassing core curriculum, differentiated enrichment and a discovery component to extend learning opportunities for these students.

Volunteers are also important members of Lowell's family, enriching our children's education. With over 2,300 volunteer hours logged last year, parents, retired people and other community members share their time and talent.

Working together as a staff, gathering the support of our neighbors and providing resources for our families helps us fulfill our mission. The "Lowell family" is at the heart of our success and takes us beyond simply teaching. It is what makes our school special.

PART IV – INDICATORS OF ACADEMIC SUCCESS

1. Assessment Results:

a) The Minnesota Comprehensive Assessments (MCA) are criterion-referenced tests that annually assess a student's and school's progress in the areas of reading and mathematics. Every spring all third and fourth grade students are given this test. These assessments help schools and districts measure student progress toward our state's academic standards. Student results are reported as measures of proficiency with students scoring in: exceeds standards, meets standards, partially meets standards, or does not meet standards. In addition to striving for every student to meet proficiency, we particularly focus our efforts on student growth for every child.

Having identified the need for a predictive indicator of success on the MCA tool, the district originally chose the Northwest Evaluation Association's Measures of Academic Progress (MAP) which is a national norm-referenced assessment. This assessment provided us with good predictability feedback for student proficiency along with information regarding each student's instructional level. As we became better at disaggregating data, we started looking for a more efficient tool that allowed for progress monitoring and increased classroom instructional time. In 2012, we adopted the STAR Enterprise assessment for reading and math. Although our tool for measurement has changed, our goal has remained the same -- to maximize the number of students reaching proficiency and individual student growth.

b) Lowell Elementary has continually outperformed state averages for student proficiency on the MCA assessments over the 2008-2013 years in both reading and math.

Significant gains in student proficiency can be attributed to increased understanding of data analysis and improvement of student identification for interventions. In addition to data analysis and intervention processes, consistent assessment practices are being utilized. Professional Learning Communities are allowing teachers to work collaboratively to better understand student information and strategies. These meetings happen across the district and include test taking strategies, implementation of interventions, and increased teacher understanding of testing processes and specifications. We are becoming more proficient at early identification of student needs using our Observation Survey model of assessment in K-2. We also offer all-day, every day Kindergarten to all students since 2008.

Our staff have an increased understanding of state standards and have aligned our curriculum process, including our recent work on standards-based report cards and common assessments. Furthermore, the use of district-level pacing guides and mapping of curriculum has been critical for our success. For the past nine years, the Literacy Collaborative and coaching model has provided teachers with a framework that guides instruction and provides resources at a student's individual level. Students who are identified for additional interventions will receive classroom support during the regular school day and supplemental Title I and Targeted Services programming. After-school and extended-year opportunities are available for our most at-risk students. Several technological resources, including IXL, FASTTMath and Accelerated Reader, also supplement these grade level interventions. Lastly, each elementary building is provided support through the Crow Wing County Family Collaborative Service Worker program. These advocates assist students and families with resource needs by providing social, emotional, and behavioral skills training.

Achievement losses may in part be attributed to community-based factors such as unemployment rates that are higher than the state average. This has resulted in greater regional mobility rates of families, particularly those with young children. Since Brainerd is the county seat where various social services are more readily available, there is an influx of families qualifying for free and reduced lunch and/or special education services. Furthermore, there is an increase in limited parental support due to families having to work more than one job. In addition to community factors, achievement losses may also be attributed to stresses on the overall school system, such as the failed levy in 2007, which resulted in the closing of two elementary schools and a complete restructure and reassignment of students and staff. In some cases, this resulted in decreased instructional time due to building logistics and budget constraints. Of particular note, when analyzing our MCA Reading data for 2011-12 and 2012-13, there is a slight decline in percentage points

from one year to the next. This decline is attributed to the change from MCA II in 2011-12 to MCA III in 2012-13. Despite the change in the test, we still remained significantly above state averages.

Lowell is using the information obtained from the NWEA and STAR Enterprise assessment to help continue to reduce the gap between the sub-groups. Special education teachers and Title I intervention teachers review the assessment results with grade level teachers to best determine the level of services, curriculum and interventions to meet the student needs. The combined team planning and assessment review has also developed a better understanding of the core standards expected at each grade level. The grade level expectations are routinely discussed during data retreats. These discussions revolve around how to meet the educational needs for all learners and not only those who are below proficiency, as it was in the past.

2. Using Assessment Results:

Various assessments are used in a cyclical fashion to examine our district programming, provide staff development, inform instructional practice and provide intervention. The following list includes specific assessments utilized:

An Observation Survey of Early Literacy Achievement (K, 1, 2),
Benchmark Assessment System (K, 1, 2),
STAR Enterprise (grades 1, 2, 3, 4),
Minnesota Comprehensive Assessments (grades 3, 4),
LEAD21 Benchmarking (grades 3, 4), and
Standards Based Common Assessments (K, 1, 2, 3, 4).

District data meetings are conducted three times per year allowing a team of district level administration, building administrators and literacy coaches to analyze current data, discuss staff development needs, and determine intervention needs of student learners. Building data meetings are then conducted to analyze current data, discuss needs of the learners through increasing quality of core instruction and the best approach to intervene. The system is monitored through an orchestrated systemic approach utilizing district grade level meetings, professional learning communities, literacy coaching and peer coaching.

For example, once a testing cycle is complete the district literacy director analyzes each elementary school's data in conjunction with their Fidelity of Implementation Tool, prior data meeting notes and goals. While analyzing fall 2012 data the team noticed a need to clarify the components of fluency across the district in both assessing and teaching practices. This finding was confirmed at each building data meeting. Throughout the remainder of the 2012-2013 school year, professional learning community time was devoted to reading and learning how to instruct and assess fluency. Consequently, teachers were more aware and often requested assistance during their coaching opportunities to brainstorm how to teach and intervene with students in need of more fluent behavior. By the spring of 2013 our district data revealed an increased understanding in how to instruct and assess behaviors associated with fluency.

Another district trend revealed in our mathematics data was the lack of proficiency in the numbers and operations standard. As teachers in each of the six elementary buildings were studying STAR data, they noticed a need to supplement the core curriculum and create interventions around numbers and operations. Supplementation was crucial to success of all learners.

The district has many systems in place to communicate with a variety of stakeholders. Teachers inform each parent/guardian of the results of our standards based common assessments, An Observation Survey of Early Literacy Achievement, Benchmark Assessment System and LEAD21 benchmarking through report cards delivered four times per school year. Classroom teachers are required to conduct at least one formal conference and are encouraged to conference when necessity by formal or informal data arises. Central office administration announce the results of MCAs through the community newspaper and the district system accountability report. District administration are required to post the results of the data of An Observation Survey of Early Literacy Achievement and Benchmark Assessment System by completing and

posting Minnesota Department of Education's Read Well By Third Grade Report data on the Brainerd Public School's website.

3. Sharing Lessons Learned:

Brainerd Public Schools support highly qualified staff through shared building and district initiatives. Probationary staff receive orientation, mentoring, and on-going training. Our entire staff are provided time to meet regularly as grade level teams. Data retreats are conducted to analyze assessment results and identify students for interventions. We have a three tiered RtI process where staff plan interventions at the classroom, grade and building levels. Professional learning communities meet monthly to review data, address successful instructional strategies and analyze curriculum effectiveness. K-4 Literacy Coaches are assigned to each site to guide and coach all teachers in data-driven instructional decisions. Educational assistants are required to have a minimum of a two-year post-secondary education or the district provides state certification (Para elink). Assistants are also provided district and site level training throughout the school year in conjunction with the Special Education Co-op, Title I, and building level leadership offerings.

District grade-level meetings are scheduled three times annually to support curriculum, instructional practices, and student achievement. District level data retreats occur throughout the year to analyze trend results and identify successful instructional strategies and ensure alignment to state adopted standards. As part of a Special Education consortium, K-12 RtI successes are collaboratively shared across building levels. District Title I staff meet throughout the year to assess implementation and progress monitoring of student growth and gap closure. Frameworks of Poverty trainings are provided for staff to develop understanding of our low income families. The district selects several teachers for leadership and focused study in the areas of math, science, literacy, and gifted-talented. These individuals have leadership roles in regional and state affiliations. Best Practice strategies and programs are highlighted through extended year training opportunities. These courses align with site, district, and individual Quality Compensation (Q-Comp) professional development goals. District building leaders participate in several job-embedded leadership opportunities. The focus of these meetings is collaboration around district initiatives, a time for sharing progress toward long-range goals, and training opportunities.

Located away from a metropolitan area, Brainerd Schools has established a cohesive process of supporting and training staff. From all the previously mentioned initiatives, we also address our needs by securing nationally renowned presenters, providing best practice "train the trainer" models, and developing internal systems.

4. Engaging Families and Community:

We attribute our academic strength and positive school climate to actively engaged family and community members. Strong partnerships provide students with a safe and caring atmosphere that encourage academic, social and emotional success.

Extra-curricular programs that support this relationship include: "Fitness for the Family" events, family fun nights, arts and music exposure and academic enrichment opportunities. Recognizing the connection between healthy minds and bodies is promoted through active games, family runs and fitness challenges. Fine and performing arts experiences provide exposure not only to students, but to families, many of whom have little access to this caliber of performance. Carnivals, bingo nights and community celebrations help nurture and model healthy family dynamics. Recognizing that a large portion of our students do not have a strong male role model at home, we have created the Tiger Dads program, inviting fathers into the school to encourage and support all of our students. We also invite families to actively participate by leading book discussions, math groups, and by surprising our students as mystery readers. Through further sharing of career development and problem solving skills with our students, parents help to affirm the value of education.

Beyond the student-family connection, we take pride in our strong community involvement. This partnership bridges a connection between schoolwork and expectations. Programs such as Junior

Achievement and Junior Police promote societal values such as personal integrity, service and charity. This ultimately encourages children to become responsible and contributing members of a global community, creating a new generation of leaders.

The strength of our connection is evident through a recent campaign to raise money for Smartboards. Individual families and local businesses expressed their support by contributing \$30,000 in two short months to make this technology available for every Lowell child. Considering our high free-and-reduced population, this project demonstrated to our students what can be accomplished through hard work and commitment.

Over the years our school has developed a reputation as one that goes above and beyond to meet student needs. The community at large has embraced our efforts as their own, enhanced our instruction and become a part of our “Lowell family.” We are not just another building in this community. We are a community...it’s opportunities, innovations and successes. Lowell School and the community are one.

PART V – CURRICULUM AND INSTRUCTION

1. Curriculum:

Brainerd Public Schools uses a seamless, articulated K-12 curriculum process whereby each curricular area is examined on a cyclical basis for alignment with state and national standards. Representatives from all levels of the system design core curricula around critical learning standards, research, best practice and differentiation. In order to ensure a system-wide approach, teams of teachers have worked to develop common summative and formative assessments aligned with Minnesota academic standards. At district curriculum meetings teachers examine student achievement data and the implications to local curriculum. This system wide approach to curriculum development, delivery and assessment assures equity of instructional opportunity and learning for all students regardless of demographics.

Differentiated curricula for reading/English language arts were adopted after extensive study of both the Minnesota standards/Common Core State Standards and best practice literacy research. Kindergarten through grade four curricula provide daily reading and writing opportunities in phonemic awareness, phonics, comprehension, fluency and vocabulary in both literature and informational texts. A well-defined schedule of common formative and summative assessments, along with daily observations, provide teachers with the data they need to determine progress toward mastery for individuals and classrooms. A district literacy trainer/coordinator and a literacy coach provide professional development and support for classroom teachers in our continuous improvement model.

The mathematics curriculum focuses on the conceptual understanding of mathematical topics and the development of students' higher-order thinking skills. A strong emphasis is placed on hands-on activities, discovering multiple approaches to mathematical procedures and problem solving through a spiraling format. Multiple opportunities for reteaching and practice, along with strategic administration of formative and summative assessments, monitor progress and measure achievement of the Minnesota Academic Standards in Mathematics.

The science curriculum is research based and developed at The Lawrence Hall of Science, University of California, Berkeley. The science program is designed to meet the challenge of providing meaningful science education for all students and to prepare them for life in the 21st century. The district has been actively engaging students in the nature of science and engineering, physical science, life science and earth science through active participation in science experiences rooted in scientific inquiry.

After studying the Minnesota Academic Standards for Social Studies, the majority of the standards were embedded in the language arts curriculum. Additional materials were purchased to ensure teachers had the necessary resources for full implementation of the standards. Students learn to think critically about important issues, problem solve, engage in inquiry and communicate findings within the required strands of citizenship and government, economics, geography and history.

Media specialists and teachers work collaboratively to develop activities within the core curriculum using the National Education Technology Standards (NETS) for students. The focus is on digital citizenship, evaluating and selecting information sources, innovative thinking and guided inquiry. Technology experiences are offered throughout the day in labs and classrooms using a variety of devices. The visual and performing arts curriculum relies on research from the National Arts Standards and the Minnesota Perpich Center for the Arts. A formalized visual arts curriculum was developed and is delivered in all grades. Key essential learnings include elements of art, principles of design, perspective, history and culture, critical thinking, creative expression and media. The National Standards for Music Education were used to choose a performing arts curriculum that provides activities so students will learn foundations as well as the artistic process of creating, performing, and responding.

The physical education and health curricula is based on the American Alliance for Health, Physical Education, Recreation and Dance. The core standards promote physically literate students who have the

knowledge, skills and confidence to enjoy a lifetime of healthy physical activity. The health curriculum develops knowledge of nutrition, safety practices and health promotion.

2. Reading/English:

In 1994 Brainerd Schools became a training site for Reading Recovery®, an intensive short term intervention for struggling first graders. Data generated from the implementation of Reading Recovery led to the recognition that substantial changes were needed to improve core literacy instruction for ALL students. Teachers and administrators spent a year researching best practice in literacy instruction. University affiliation engaged us with a national network bringing current research to teachers through a tiered coaching professional development model and allowed for common instructional language. In 2001, a K-5 literacy framework was piloted and subsequently implemented with assistance from a Comprehensive School Reform Grant. Professional Learning Communities and literacy coaching were established in 2003-04. This dynamic growth model informs and sustains literacy training in a continuous-improvement, capacity-building model. An Observation Survey of Early Literacy Achievement, text leveling, common assessments, NWEA, MCA, and STAR Enterprise provide data for problem solving teams to:

Strengthen instruction for all learners through intensive inquiry based professional development. For example, a team of district administrators, school leaders and coaches analyzed data. A trend indicating a plateau in growth regarding long vowel patterns was apparent. This resulted in system-wide professional development around word study application to reading and writing.

Interventions are provided for over- and under-performing students through individualized and small group instruction. For example, based upon results from the letter identification task, kindergarten learners were identified to receive intensive instruction that was progress monitored with a progressive teaching protocol.

Instruction is based on the gradual release model -- whole group, small group to independent application. Data informed decisions determine which strategic actions to teach during whole group mini-lessons in reading and writing workshop. Based upon running records of oral reading, a teacher observed readers decoding words but not reading fluently. A shared reading mini-lesson taught readers how to group words together in meaningful phrases.

Strategic actions are reinforced in small group guided reading and writing lessons. A guided reading lesson was designed to address dysfluent reading by adjusting text level and prompting for behaviors previously taught in the whole group mini-lesson.

Learners apply previously taught literacy behaviors independently. Phrasing strategies are encouraged in independent reading. The teacher confers with students to check for application.

Assessments facilitate a bridge between theory and instruction, based on Marie Clay's literacy processing theory. Teachers incorporate differentiated methods of instruction to teach complex strategic actions used by successful readers and writers.

3. Mathematics:

The mathematics curriculum at our school for the last 20 years has been the Everyday Mathematics series. This program provides conceptual understanding through activities and multiple approaches to mathematical problem solving through a spiraling format. The format allows students to practice concepts and skills throughout the year. Spiraling supports reteaching concepts a student may not have mastered. For students who have previously mastered concepts, this instructional method provides independent practice for higher level enrichment. A variety of teaching methods, questioning strategies and hands-on activities are used to teach skills at various levels. Students are asked to respond to questions orally, in written or picture form and with manipulatives. Students are flexibly grouped to meet their academic needs - whole group, small group, and with one-to-one support..

Formative and summative assessments are administered frequently in order to measure mastery of the Minnesota Mathematics Standards and to monitor progress. In addition to classroom assessments, which are aligned to the standards-based report card, standardized tests are used to help determine the level of mastery towards grade level benchmarks. In the past, Northwest Evaluation Association (NWEA) tests were administered fall, winter and spring as the district benchmarking tool. Currently, the STAR Enterprise tests are used in that capacity. Students also take the Minnesota Comprehensive Assessments in Mathematics. Computer based assessments give teachers immediate feedback for instructional planning, evaluating curriculum and measuring student achievement.

Students at all levels are provided opportunities for success. Within the classroom, students share and compare solutions through oral presentations, the use of marker boards and various technological platforms. Multiple interventions are employed to meet the individual needs of students not achieving at grade-level standards. Specific software provides additional support for fact fluency. Special Education teachers, Title I teachers and paraprofessionals work to support student success. Students with special needs who need additional math instruction are also given time in resource rooms where special education teachers modify and supplement instruction. Everyday Math, Saxon and Equals are the most common supplemental materials used. Targeted services are also provided after school and during summer to pre-teach concepts and close academic achievement gaps.

4. Additional Curriculum Area:

Lowell Elementary provides and fosters opportunity, innovation and success in science education by fully implementing the Full Option Science System (FOSS). This program is dedicated to the improvement and learning of science and provides opportunities for students to increase their capacity to think critically. Scientific knowledge advances when students use observation skills, test ideas in logical ways and generate explanations that integrate new information into an established order. Students discover what is known (content) and how it became known (process). Students are given opportunity to learn important scientific concepts, to be innovative, to think critically and construct new ideas and thoughts through inquiries, investigations and analyses. Students are engaged in these processes as they explore the natural and the man-made worlds.

Students are accountable for standards that focus on four main strands of science: Nature of Science and Engineering, Life, Earth and Physical Science. For example, a Kindergarten standard includes learning how living things are diverse with many different observable characteristics. The Trees Module is used to foster this learning. Each classroom is given a real tree, allowing students to observe its many characteristics. The classroom tree is planted at the district school forest. Learning continues as they observe its growth in subsequent years. In grade four, students study how rocks and earth materials may vary in compositions. The Earth Materials Module provides investigations allowing students to observe physical characteristics of earth material. Students focus on examining and dissecting earth materials using scientific tools to understand the physical properties of earth materials. A common assessment is given at the end of each module.

The district supported professional development by providing a teacher on special assignment who mentored teachers and assured resource allocation as the program was implemented. Additional professional development opportunities were provided. These initiatives have provided students with a solid foundational and comprehensive science education, supported staff and have ensured that all staff were given the necessary resources to deliver a premier elementary science program.

This additional curricular area was chosen because of the illustration of the alignment of a research-based, hands-on, inquiry driven curriculum, high quality staff development and exceptional levels of student achievement. The Minnesota Comprehensive Assessments in Science are administered annually in grade five. The test is a culmination of grade three, four and five Minnesota Academic Standards for Science. On the 2013 MCA Science test, district grade five students scored 84.5% proficiency, consistently scoring above the Minnesota state average of 59.7%.

5. Instructional Methods:

In core curricula areas differentiation is embedded in each program. In reading/language arts the use of guided reading is core to the instructional model and is enhanced through leveled materials and technology. Hardware was provided for each classroom to enhance differentiated skill development, assessment, and inquiry. A data warehouse is provided to track individual student achievement and result of interventions.

Students who qualify for Title 1 are provided research based programs. Programs are aligned with district curriculum and state standards. Delivery of services is determined based on students needs and abilities. Interventions vary from small group to one-on-one instruction and occur in both classroom embedded and pull out formats.

Special education teachers collaborate with classroom teachers to provide the necessary accommodations and modifications to maintain placement of students with disabilities in the core instruction. In addition, special education teachers provide supplemental instruction and monitor individual progress to meet student needs. Assistive technologies such as smart pens, scanning apps, talk to text and interactive books continue to allow more struggling learners to grow in the core.

Brainerd Public Schools most capable learners encounter numerous opportunities for differentiation beginning at the elementary level. Embedded in each curricula area are differentiation options for classroom teachers to implement. In addition, the district assesses all kindergarten students with the CogAT 7 screening form, an abbreviated cognitive abilities test. Based on the data gathered from this assessment, student academic need is addressed with a 4 Tier model. Tier I is general differentiation that occurs day to day as a student interacts with a variety of curriculum. Tier II allows for students that show ability in a certain unit of study to encounter a specific modification that challenges them further. Tier III provides regular opportunities in small cluster groups and is focused on reading and math. Identified curriculum might include Junior Great Books and M3 Math. Tier IV is defined by our AGATE Academy, a school-within-a-school model for grades 1-4. Students that qualify for this level of programming encounter opportunities for subject acceleration and enrichment on a daily basis.

6. Professional Development:

Brainerd Public Schools staff development approach is dedicated to providing opportunity through which educators acquire or enhance the knowledge, skills, attitudes and beliefs necessary to create high levels of learning for all students. The district employs a multi-layered approach and job-embedded staff development opportunities. A district-wide committee establishes a district direction. Site-levels enhance the district base and address unique needs of their respective buildings and teachers to support best-practice school improvement.

District staff development supports teachers becoming students of the profession by continually renewing and learning for professional growth; it supports improved student learning and achievement. Summer training opportunities include training for all staff to support special education students, improving utilization of technology for instruction and assessment of student understanding, literacy instruction and data collection, curriculum alignment for all content areas and working with disadvantaged students. The staff development from these trainings transition into the individual school goals based on the diversity and challenges of their student demographics.

Special education leaders and teachers play vital roles in grade level and professional development meetings both at the building and district level. Special education professional development goals continue to focus on instructional strategies and approaches based upon each student's unique needs. There is more collaboration between general education and special education teachers than ever before; it is about building capacity in all learners. New and veteran special education teachers go through extensive learning prior to the start of each school year. Assessment, differentiation strategies, executive functioning and classroom impact are covered.

The job-embedded staff development process is supported by Minnesota's Quality Compensation network. This job-embedded staff development program is centered around: site goals for improved student achievement; focused peer learning communities where data is analyzed and best-practice instruction is researched; and individual peer coaching where individuals set personal growth goals and coaches observe lessons and collect instructional data.

Peer observation, and probationary teacher mentorship, has primarily focused on literacy at the K-2 level, while at grades three and four peer coaching is more general to best-practice instructional techniques and classroom management. In both cases however, observations and feedback are completed in the context of individual teacher goals. Teachers support one another toward improvement and achievement of individual and school-wide goals. Teachers use feedback from formal and informal peer observations, self-evaluations and student assessment data in choosing further professional development training.

7. School Leadership

Leadership at Lowell is grounded upon our principal's philosophy of leading by example. Through active engagement in both district and school affairs, his involvement has influenced teachers and staff to participate in matters beyond individual classrooms. Guided by a belief that a school is bigger than any one person, he has inspired others to share in decision-making processes. This creates a positive school community and promotes a successful learning environment for students. Our principal encourages staff to reach their highest potential by balancing supportive-guidance and teacher autonomy. This continues to propel our school toward the forefront of teaching and learning.

Each staff member, parent and student is both a leader and participant in the decision making process. For example, our site team consists of employee representatives that focus on building issues and concerns. The Parent/Teacher Association meets monthly to support initiatives and solidify the home/school connection. To extend leadership to our students, second through fourth graders take part in student council which introduces them to the leadership process by enabling them to make decisions on behalf of their peers.

Other key leadership teams include our Building Literacy Team (gives direction to interventions and innovations), Crisis/Safety Team (discusses improvements to school safety), PLCs (centers around student data and selected curricular areas), AGATE Team (creates curriculum to meet the needs of gifted learners), and Child Study / RTI Teams (analyzes Tier II and Tier III interventions for our hardest to reach students). These teams focus on development and implementation of future initiatives, which involves frequent trainings. We empower teacher leaders to expand on their expertise to benefit everyone at Lowell. Many teacher leaders are peer coaches within our building, who help teachers reflect on their instruction. Lowell also employs a literacy coach. She supports staff by consulting with teachers regarding at-risk students, provides training for teachers and educational assistants and analyzes data to facilitate continuous improvement.

Our goal is to create leaders in everyone, including our students. We partner with parents, encouraging them to play an active role in their child's education. We empower staff to find success for their students and never be satisfied with the status quo. Together we strive to be on the cutting edge of education by providing students with a nurturing platform on which happy and successful lives can be built.

PART VII - ASSESSMENT RESULTS

STATE CRITERION--REFERENCED TESTS

Subject: Math

Test: Minnesota Comprehensive Assessment
III

All Students Tested/Grade: 3

Edition/Publication Year: 2011

Publisher: MN Department of Education

School Year	2012-2013	2011-2012	2010-2011	2009-2010	2008-2009
Testing month	Apr	Apr	Apr	Jan	Jan
SCHOOL SCORES*					
% Proficient plus (+) % Exceeds	82	86	83		
% Exceeds	47	40	40		
Number of students tested	94	73	82		
Percent of total students tested	98	100	100		
Number of students tested with alternative assessment	2	0	0		
% of students tested with alternative assessment	2	0	0		
SUBGROUP SCORES					
1. Free and Reduced-Price Meals/Socio-Economic/Disadvantaged Students					
% Proficient plus (+) % Exceeds	63	74	80		
% Exceeds	27	24	20		
Number of students tested	41	34	30		
2. Students receiving Special Education					
% Proficient plus (+) % Exceeds	44	78	67		
% Exceeds	33	0	17		
Number of students tested	9	9	6		
3. English Language Learner Students					
% Proficient plus (+) % Exceeds					
% Exceeds					
Number of students tested					
4. Hispanic or Latino Students					
% Proficient plus (+) % Exceeds					
% Exceeds					
Number of students tested					
5. African- American Students					
% Proficient plus (+) % Exceeds					
% Exceeds					

Number of students tested					
6. Asian Students					
% Proficient plus (+) % Exceeds					
% Exceeds					
Number of students tested					
7. American Indian or Alaska Native Students					
% Proficient plus (+) % Exceeds					
% Exceeds					
Number of students tested					
8. Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander Students					
% Proficient plus (+) % Exceeds					
% Exceeds					
Number of students tested					
9. White Students					
% Proficient plus (+) % Exceeds	84	87	83		
% Exceeds	50	43	44		
Number of students tested	86	68	71		
10. Two or More Races identified Students					
% Proficient plus (+) % Exceeds					
% Exceeds					
Number of students tested					
11. Other 1: Other 1					
% Proficient plus (+) % Exceeds					
% Exceeds					
Number of students tested					
12. Other 2: Other 2					
% Proficient plus (+) % Exceeds					
% Exceeds					
Number of students tested					
13. Other 3: Other 3					
% Proficient plus (+) % Exceeds					
% Exceeds					
Number of students tested					

NOTES:

STATE CRITERION--REFERENCED TESTS

Subject: Math

Test: Minnesota Comprehensive Assessment II

All Students Tested/Grade: 3

Edition/Publication Year: 2006

Publisher: MN Department of Education

School Year	2012-2013	2011-2012	2010-2011	2009-2010	2008-2009
Testing month	Jan	Jan	Jan	Apr	Apr
SCHOOL SCORES*					
% Proficient plus % Exceeds				88	89
% Exceeds				53	55
Number of students tested				73	87
Percent of total students tested				100	100
Number of students tested with alternative assessment				0	0
% of students tested with alternative assessment				0	0
SUBGROUP SCORES					
1. Free and Reduced-Price Meals/Socio-Economic/Disadvantaged Students					
% Proficient plus % Exceeds				75	57
% Exceeds				31	5
Number of students tested				32	21
2. Students receiving Special Education					
% Proficient plus % Exceeds				17	50
% Exceeds				0	50
Number of students tested				6	6
3. English Language Learner Students					
% Proficient plus % Exceeds					
% Exceeds					
Number of students tested					
4. Hispanic or Latino Students					
% Proficient plus % Exceeds					
% Exceeds					
Number of students tested					
5. African- American Students					
% Proficient plus % Exceeds					
% Exceeds					
Number of students tested					
6. Asian Students					
% Proficient plus % Exceeds					
% Exceeds					
Number of students tested					
7. American Indian or Alaska Native Students					
% Proficient plus % Exceeds					

% Exceeds					
Number of students tested					
8. Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander Students					
% Proficient plus % Exceeds					
% Exceeds					
Number of students tested					
9. White Students					
% Proficient plus % Exceeds				88	89
% Exceeds				54	55
Number of students tested				67	82
10. Two or More Races identified Students					
% Proficient plus % Exceeds					
% Exceeds					
Number of students tested					
11. Other 1: Other 1					
% Proficient plus % Exceeds					
% Exceeds					
Number of students tested					
12. Other 2: Other 2					
% Proficient plus % Exceeds					
% Exceeds					
Number of students tested					
13. Other 3: Other 3					
% Proficient plus % Exceeds					
% Exceeds					
Number of students tested					

NOTES:

STATE CRITERION--REFERENCED TESTS

Subject: Math

Test: Minnesota Comprehensive Assessment
III

All Students Tested/Grade: 4

Edition/Publication Year: 2011

Publisher: MN Department of Education

School Year	2012-2013	2011-2012	2010-2011	2009-2010	2008-2009
Testing month	Apr	Apr	Apr	Jan	Jan
SCHOOL SCORES*					
% Proficient plus % Exceeds	85	94	75		
% Exceeds	57	37	48		
Number of students tested	72	84	81		
Percent of total students tested	100	100	100		
Number of students tested with alternative assessment	0	0	0		
% of students tested with alternative assessment	0	0	0		
SUBGROUP SCORES					
1. Free and Reduced-Price Meals/Socio-Economic/Disadvantaged Students					
% Proficient plus % Exceeds	72	91	54		
% Exceeds	34	19	26		
Number of students tested	32	32	39		
2. Students receiving Special Education					
% Proficient plus % Exceeds	60	90	42		
% Exceeds	10	10	8		
Number of students tested	10	10	12		
3. English Language Learner Students					
% Proficient plus % Exceeds					
% Exceeds					
Number of students tested					
4. Hispanic or Latino Students					
% Proficient plus % Exceeds					
% Exceeds					
Number of students tested					
5. African- American Students					
% Proficient plus % Exceeds					
% Exceeds					
Number of students tested					
6. Asian Students					
% Proficient plus % Exceeds					
% Exceeds					
Number of students tested					
7. American Indian or Alaska Native Students					
% Proficient plus % Exceeds					

% Exceeds					
Number of students tested					
8. Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander Students					
% Proficient plus % Exceeds					
% Exceeds					
Number of students tested					
9. White Students					
% Proficient plus % Exceeds	84	93	77		
% Exceeds	57	39	50		
Number of students tested	68	72	74		
10. Two or More Races identified Students					
% Proficient plus % Exceeds					
% Exceeds					
Number of students tested					
11. Other 1: Other 1					
% Proficient plus % Exceeds					
% Exceeds					
Number of students tested					
12. Other 2: Other 2					
% Proficient plus % Exceeds					
% Exceeds					
Number of students tested					
13. Other 3: Other 3					
% Proficient plus % Exceeds					
% Exceeds					
Number of students tested					

NOTES:

STATE CRITERION--REFERENCED TESTS

Subject: Math

Test: Minnesota Comprehensive Assessment II

All Students Tested/Grade: 4

Edition/Publication Year: 2006

Publisher: MN Department of Education

School Year	2012-2013	2011-2012	2010-2011	2009-2010	2008-2009
Testing month	Jan	Jan	Jan	Apr	Apr
SCHOOL SCORES*					
% Proficient plus % Exceeds				92	77
% Exceeds				59	40
Number of students tested				86	77
Percent of total students tested				100	100
Number of students tested with alternative assessment				0	0
% of students tested with alternative assessment				0	0
SUBGROUP SCORES					
1. Free and Reduced-Price Meals/Socio-Economic/Disadvantaged Students					
% Proficient plus % Exceeds				82	71
% Exceeds				22	24
Number of students tested				27	21
2. Students receiving Special Education					
% Proficient plus % Exceeds				63	33
% Exceeds				50	17
Number of students tested				8	6
3. English Language Learner Students					
% Proficient plus % Exceeds					
% Exceeds					
Number of students tested					
4. Hispanic or Latino Students					
% Proficient plus % Exceeds					
% Exceeds					
Number of students tested					
5. African- American Students					
% Proficient plus % Exceeds					
% Exceeds					
Number of students tested					
6. Asian Students					
% Proficient plus % Exceeds					
% Exceeds					
Number of students tested					
7. American Indian or Alaska Native Students					
% Proficient plus % Exceeds					

% Exceeds					
Number of students tested					
8. Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander Students					
% Proficient plus % Exceeds					
% Exceeds					
Number of students tested					
9. White Students					
% Proficient plus % Exceeds				91	76
% Exceeds				59	41
Number of students tested				81	71
10. Two or More Races identified Students					
% Proficient plus % Exceeds					
% Exceeds					
Number of students tested					
11. Other 1: Other 1					
% Proficient plus % Exceeds					
% Exceeds					
Number of students tested					
12. Other 2: Other 2					
% Proficient plus % Exceeds					
% Exceeds					
Number of students tested					
13. Other 3: Other 3					
% Proficient plus % Exceeds					
% Exceeds					
Number of students tested					

NOTES:

STATE CRITERION--REFERENCED TESTS

Subject: Reading/ELA

Test: Minnesota Comprehensive Assessment
III

All Students Tested/Grade: 3

Edition/Publication Year: 2013

Publisher: MN Department of Education

School Year	2012-2013	2011-2012	2010-2011	2009-2010	2008-2009
Testing month	Apr	Jan	Jan	Jan	Jan
SCHOOL SCORES*					
% Proficient plus % Exceeds	75				
% Exceeds	29				
Number of students tested	94				
Percent of total students tested	98				
Number of students tested with alternative assessment	2				
% of students tested with alternative assessment	2				
SUBGROUP SCORES					
1. Free and Reduced-Price Meals/Socio-Economic/Disadvantaged Students					
% Proficient plus % Exceeds	61				
% Exceeds	17				
Number of students tested	41				
2. Students receiving Special Education					
% Proficient plus % Exceeds	33				
% Exceeds	22				
Number of students tested	9				
3. English Language Learner Students					
% Proficient plus % Exceeds					
% Exceeds					
Number of students tested					
4. Hispanic or Latino Students					
% Proficient plus % Exceeds					
% Exceeds					
Number of students tested					
5. African- American Students					
% Proficient plus % Exceeds					
% Exceeds					
Number of students tested					
6. Asian Students					
% Proficient plus % Exceeds					
% Exceeds					
Number of students tested					
7. American Indian or Alaska Native Students					
% Proficient plus % Exceeds					

% Exceeds					
Number of students tested					
8. Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander Students					
% Proficient plus % Exceeds					
% Exceeds					
Number of students tested					
9. White Students					
% Proficient plus % Exceeds	77				
% Exceeds	30				
Number of students tested	86				
10. Two or More Races identified Students					
% Proficient plus % Exceeds					
% Exceeds					
Number of students tested					
11. Other 1: Other 1					
% Proficient plus % Exceeds					
% Exceeds					
Number of students tested					
12. Other 2: Other 2					
% Proficient plus % Exceeds					
% Exceeds					
Number of students tested					
13. Other 3: Other 3					
% Proficient plus % Exceeds					
% Exceeds					
Number of students tested					

NOTES:

STATE CRITERION--REFERENCED TESTS

Subject: Reading/ELA

Test: Minnesota Comprehensive Assessment II

All Students Tested/Grade: 3

Edition/Publication Year: 2008

Publisher: MN Department of Education

School Year	2012-2013	2011-2012	2010-2011	2009-2010	2008-2009
Testing month	Jan	Apr	Apr	Apr	Apr
SCHOOL SCORES*					
% Proficient plus % Exceeds		92	89	84	90
% Exceeds		70	65	64	70
Number of students tested		73	82	73	87
Percent of total students tested		100	100	100	100
Number of students tested with alternative assessment		0	0	0	0
% of students tested with alternative assessment		0	0	0	0
SUBGROUP SCORES					
1. Free and Reduced-Price Meals/Socio-Economic/Disadvantaged Students					
% Proficient plus % Exceeds		85	83	66	71
% Exceeds		47	50	44	24
Number of students tested		34	30	32	21
2. Students receiving Special Education					
% Proficient plus % Exceeds		67	50	17	50
% Exceeds		22	17	0	50
Number of students tested		9	6	6	6
3. English Language Learner Students					
% Proficient plus % Exceeds					
% Exceeds					
Number of students tested					
4. Hispanic or Latino Students					
% Proficient plus % Exceeds					
% Exceeds					
Number of students tested					
5. African- American Students					
% Proficient plus % Exceeds					
% Exceeds					
Number of students tested					
6. Asian Students					
% Proficient plus % Exceeds					
% Exceeds					
Number of students tested					
7. American Indian or Alaska Native Students					
% Proficient plus % Exceeds					

% Exceeds					
Number of students tested					
8. Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander Students					
% Proficient plus % Exceeds					
% Exceeds					
Number of students tested					
9. White Students					
% Proficient plus % Exceeds		91	89	84	89
% Exceeds		68	66	66	72
Number of students tested		68	71	67	82
10. Two or More Races identified Students					
% Proficient plus % Exceeds					
% Exceeds					
Number of students tested					
11. Other 1: Other 1					
% Proficient plus % Exceeds					
% Exceeds					
Number of students tested					
12. Other 2: Other 2					
% Proficient plus % Exceeds					
% Exceeds					
Number of students tested					
13. Other 3: Other 3					
% Proficient plus % Exceeds					
% Exceeds					
Number of students tested					

NOTES:

STATE CRITERION--REFERENCED TESTS

Subject: Reading/ELA

Test: Minnesota Comprehensive Assessment
III

All Students Tested/Grade: 4

Edition/Publication Year: 2013

Publisher: MN Department of Education

School Year	2012-2013	2011-2012	2010-2011	2009-2010	2008-2009
Testing month	Apr	Jan	Jan	Jan	Jan
SCHOOL SCORES*					
% Proficient plus % Exceeds	74				
% Exceeds	38				
Number of students tested	72				
Percent of total students tested	100				
Number of students tested with alternative assessment	0				
% of students tested with alternative assessment	0				
SUBGROUP SCORES					
1. Free and Reduced-Price Meals/Socio-Economic/Disadvantaged Students					
% Proficient plus % Exceeds	53				
% Exceeds	13				
Number of students tested	32				
2. Students receiving Special Education					
% Proficient plus % Exceeds	30				
% Exceeds	0				
Number of students tested	10				
3. English Language Learner Students					
% Proficient plus % Exceeds					
% Exceeds					
Number of students tested					
4. Hispanic or Latino Students					
% Proficient plus % Exceeds					
% Exceeds					
Number of students tested					
5. African- American Students					
% Proficient plus % Exceeds					
% Exceeds					
Number of students tested					
6. Asian Students					
% Proficient plus % Exceeds					
% Exceeds					
Number of students tested					
7. American Indian or Alaska Native Students					
% Proficient plus % Exceeds					

% Exceeds					
Number of students tested					
8. Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander Students					
% Proficient plus % Exceeds					
% Exceeds					
Number of students tested					
9. White Students					
% Proficient plus % Exceeds	75				
% Exceeds	38				
Number of students tested	68				
10. Two or More Races identified Students					
% Proficient plus % Exceeds					
% Exceeds					
Number of students tested					
11. Other 1: Other 1					
% Proficient plus % Exceeds					
% Exceeds					
Number of students tested					
12. Other 2: Other 2					
% Proficient plus % Exceeds					
% Exceeds					
Number of students tested					
13. Other 3: Other 3					
% Proficient plus % Exceeds					
% Exceeds					
Number of students tested					

NOTES:

STATE CRITERION--REFERENCED TESTS

Subject: Reading/ELA

Test: Minnesota Comprehensive Assessment II

All Students Tested/Grade: 4

Edition/Publication Year: 2008

Publisher: MN Department of Education

School Year	2012-2013	2011-2012	2010-2011	2009-2010	2008-2009
Testing month	Jan	Apr	Apr	Apr	Apr
SCHOOL SCORES*					
% Proficient plus % Exceeds		88	76	86	83
% Exceeds		60	51	63	49
Number of students tested		84	82	86	77
Percent of total students tested		100	100	100	100
Number of students tested with alternative assessment		0	0	0	0
% of students tested with alternative assessment		0	0	0	0
SUBGROUP SCORES					
1. Free and Reduced-Price Meals/Socio-Economic/Disadvantaged Students					
% Proficient plus % Exceeds		75	100	67	71
% Exceeds		44	25	22	43
Number of students tested		32	40	27	21
2. Students receiving Special Education					
% Proficient plus % Exceeds		60	42	50	17
% Exceeds		20	17	50	17
Number of students tested		10	12	8	6
3. English Language Learner Students					
% Proficient plus % Exceeds					
% Exceeds					
Number of students tested					
4. Hispanic or Latino Students					
% Proficient plus % Exceeds					
% Exceeds					
Number of students tested					
5. African- American Students					
% Proficient plus % Exceeds					
% Exceeds					
Number of students tested					
6. Asian Students					
% Proficient plus % Exceeds					
% Exceeds					
Number of students tested					
7. American Indian or Alaska Native Students					
% Proficient plus % Exceeds					

% Exceeds					
Number of students tested					
8. Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander Students					
% Proficient plus % Exceeds					
% Exceeds					
Number of students tested					
9. White Students					
% Proficient plus % Exceeds		89	77	85	82
% Exceeds		63	53	62	49
Number of students tested		72	74	81	71
10. Two or More Races identified Students					
% Proficient plus % Exceeds					
% Exceeds					
Number of students tested					
11. Other 1: Other 1					
% Proficient plus % Exceeds					
% Exceeds					
Number of students tested					
12. Other 2: Other 2					
% Proficient plus % Exceeds					
% Exceeds					
Number of students tested					
13. Other 3: Other 3					
% Proficient plus % Exceeds					
% Exceeds					
Number of students tested					

NOTES: